Appendix

1996 1995

104(g)(1) Operator Outreach Program Evaluation Survey

State					
EPA Region					
Organization					
Contact name					
Phone n	umber				
Fax					
1. Please identif	State regulato	nmental training ce ry agency	enter		
Please provid	e information a	nich you received 10 bout all of your rece cing profile of your p	ent funding for waste	water treatment plant ou	itreach. We are
Fiscal Year	104(g) Fundi Amount	ng Federal Expenditu	State Mat	ch Other Fu	
1998					
1997					
1996					
1995					
needed). Source (Fede	ral, State, local,	or other)	ndicate the source(s)		litional pages if
and the perso O&M, finand (number of p	n days provided cing, and capital erson days divid	I. Include all on-site I improvement plan ed by number of pro	operator and manag ning. These number	ers of wastewater treatme ger training, as well as tee s will be used to derive ty th of project) and average nother.	chnical assistance in pical service levels
Fiscal Year	Goal (as specified to EPA)	Actual # of Facilities Assisted	Total # of Person Days Provided	# of Carry-Over Visits (one year to the next)	# of Follow-Up Visits
1998					
1997					

4. Please provide information about the 104(g) assistance providers and identify support personnel for your program. Indicate numbers and "FT" for full time and "PT" for part time. In the comments section, please also note their years of experience and the source of their funding (F-federal, S-state, O-other).

Fiscal Year	Number of	Number of	Number of Support Staff	Comments
	Technical Staff	Contractors/	(administrative assts,	
	(employees)	Consultants	secretaries, budget	
		Providing Technical	specialists, grant	
		Assistance	managers, etc.)	
Example	1 FT	2 PT	1 FT secretary (funded	Technical personnel have
			50% by 104)	more than 15 yrs exp. each,
			1 PT budget analyst	funded 75% federal and 25%
			1 PT grants specialist	state. Admin support, grant
				mgmt provided by college.
1998				
1997				
1996				
1995				

5.	If you lost your 104(g) funding, what would happen to your program? Elimination of technical assistance for WWTPs
	Continued program, but with reduction in staff, reduction in services offered, reduction in number of systems assisted, or reduction in length of time invested at systems (please underline all that
	apply)
	Other (please describe)
6.	If your 104(g) funding were increased, what would be the effect on your program? (check all that apply) Increase in staff
	Expansion of services offered
	Increase in number of systems assisted
	Increase in length of time invested at systems
	Other (please describe)
7.	Where do your requests for technical assistance originate? (please indicate approximate percentage of frequency e.g., 35% operators, 40% regulatory agency referral, 25% classroom training)
	Operators
	Utility or WWTP managers
	Local officials Personal by State regulatory or other agency
	Referral by State regulatory or other agency
	Technical assistance as part of enforcement action
	Contacts during classroom training Other (please describe)
	Other (prease describe)
8.	Please rank the circumstances for delivery of 104(g) assistance.
	(F "frequently"; S "sometimes"; N "never")
	System is not complying with NPDES permit
	System is in compliance with NPDES permit, but at high risk of non-compliance
	System is in compliance with NPDES permit, but has a new operator on staff
	System not required to have NPDES permit, no discharge to receiving waters
	System should have a permit, but it has not been issued
	System has other permit violations; i.e., 503b, UIC, state inspection reports, other state permits, tribal permits
	System is in start-up status
	System received 104(g) assistance, project was closed, but system needs help again ("repeat work' Other (please describe)
Λ	Dlease estimate the persentage of total facilities you have samed by
9.	Please estimate the percentage of total facilities you have served by:
	Assisting out-of-compliance plants to helping maintain compliance
	Optimizing operations Helping plants in danger of non-compliance
	LICIOING DIAIRS III GANGEL OF HOH-COMDHANCE

10.	Please list the top 10 performance limiting factors, in order from most to least important, that you see in the field (use EPA PLF codes attached, but add descriptions if necessary for clarity).
11.	If you believe that your program's outreach is limited, please describe what you believe are <i>your program's</i> "performance limiting factors." Please rank each factor on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the most significant. Please include comments, if appropriate. Insufficient operating budget
	Poor public awareness and understanding of the program
	Inadequate marketing of the program
	Lack of administrative support and communication between EPA and grantees
	Inadequate staffing
	Lack of support for program at the local level
	Insufficient support for operators by local officials and managers Insufficient funds for equipment replacement and repair
	Interference or lack of support from other agencies
	Response time problems
	Travel considerations (time, funding)
	Other (please describe)
12.	What do you see as the key successes of the 104(g) program? Please rank each factor on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the most significant. Please include comments, if appropriate.
	Improved system compliance Enhanced community and public education about wastewater treatment
	
	Financial savings or other direct economic benefits for communities Increased managerial and capital improvement planning skills at the local level
	Enhanced operator professionalism (certification, involvement in professional
	associations, participation in training)
	Development of a skilled technical assistance workforce, with special understanding of small
	communities' financial and political constraints Other, please specify
13.	What do you see as the main reason(s) for the 104(g) program's success? Please rank from in order of priority,
	with 1 being the most important.
	Commitment to long-term and comprehensive on-site assistance Assignment of technical assistance providers with special expertise
	in working with small communities
	Technical assistance by professionals with plant operating experience
	(peer-group assistance or mentoring approach)
	Partnerships with State agencies (non-monetary support such as referrals)
	Other, please specify
14.	It is commonly believed that the 104 program has launched other, complementary programs. What other services do you offer which have been developed in response to needs identified through 104(g) funded work? Please check all that apply.
	Energy audits
	Pollution prevention audits
	Train-the-trainer
	Local official training Management training
	D
	Development of standards for community review of engineering proposals
	Advanced operations training
	Classroom training (in general)
	Drinking water (or other media) technical assistance and training

Case Studies

Please describe three to five of your State's most successful, innovative, or impressive assistance projects. Try to pick examples that are recent and that represent the key themes outlined in the cover letter. If possible, please provide photographs, charts, and other visual aids to present key information. Also send quotations from those who received assistance, including their name, title, and facility/community. We will use these in the report to support case study presentations and other findings. Please complete the following for each case study provided:

- 1. Name of Facility
- 2. Design Capacity, MGD
- 3. Size of Population Served
- 4. Type of Treatment
- 5. Contact Person/104 Technical Assistance Provider(s)
- 6. Brief Description of the Trainer's Assessment of the Problem (can use PLFs)
- 7. Description of Assistance Provided
- 8. Date of Project Start-Up and Length of Time That Project Was Open
- 9. Compliance Status at Beginning of Project and at End of Project
- 10. Approximate Amount of 104(g) Money Spent
- 11. Approximate Amount(s) and Source(s) of Supplemental Funding

For each case study, if possible, please provide the following information to help evaluate quantify benefits:

- Estimate the cost of equivalent advice and training from private engineering consultants (base figures on \$15,000 per 40 hour week of OME analysis, including travel and overhead)
- Estimate the probable cost to the state agency of added inspections, consent orders or other enforcement activities that would have been necessary had the 104(g) program not provided assistance
- Estimate fines and other penalties that the system would have borne
- Estimate reduced operating expenses, including energy efficiency improvements, as a direct result of the 104(g)
 assistance (base figures on actual savings in operating expenses; provide separate estimates of postponed capital
 expenditures)
- Estimate the pounds of pollutants prevented from entering the environment (base figures on quantifiable reductions in pollutants released by comparing pre- and post-assistance discharge monitoring reports, also note permit limits; show figures in pounds or tons per year reduced)

PLFs = Performance Limiting Factors Codes

- A— Poor understanding and application of process control by operator
- B— Staffing (too few staff, low pay, turnover, etc.)
- **C** Support from municipality (administrative and technical)
- D— Operating budget and user charge system
- E— Operability/maintainability considerations (process flexibility, automation, standby units, alternate power source)
- F— I/
- **G** Construction problems
- H—Process design errors (clarifiers, aerators, disinfection, etc.)
- I— Over design
- J— Under design
- K— Solids handling and sludge disposal
- L— Pretreatment, industrial dischargers, and toxics
- M-O&M manual
- N—O&M program
- O— Spare parts inventory
- **P** Chemical inventory
- Q— Laboratory capability for process/NPDES testing
- **R** NPDES reporting
- S— Equipment/unit processes broken down/inoperable
- T— Hydraulic overload
- U—Poor aeration system

104(g)(1) Operator Outreach Program Evaluation Survey EPA Regional Coordinators

EPA Region _____

	Phone numbe Fax	r		
				(g) coordination in your region. Indicate omments section, please also note their years of
Fisc	cal Year	Number of Personnel and Roles	Number of Support Staff (administrative assts, secretaries, budget specialists, grant managers, etc.)	Comments
Exa	nmple	1 FT Coordinator (funded 100% by 104)	1 FT secretary (funded 50% by 104) 1 PT budget analyst 1 PT grants specialist	Coordinator in program for 15 yrs
199	18			
199)7			
199				
199)5			
2.	What types of	Technical oversigh Provision of on-site Coordination of re (if so, how often? _ Individual meeting	oordination (administration of the of state projects are technical assistance gional meetings of 104(g) projects with state 104(g) providers amunity representatives to manually control of the order of	viders (if so, how often?)
3.	What criteria	Overall success of a Quality of technica Number of systems Technical assistance	the state's assistance program al assistance provided assisted ce needs in a state ons of funding (roughly same a	

4.	If you believe that your program's outreach is limited, please describe what you believe are your program's
	"performance limiting factors." Please rank each factor on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the most significant.
	Please include comments, if appropriate.
	Insufficient operating budget
	Poor public awareness and understanding of the program
	Inadequate marketing of the program
	Lack of communication between EPA headquarters, regional offices, and grantees
	Inadequate staffing
	Interference or lack of support from other agencies
	Travel considerations (time, funding)
	Other (please describe)
5.	What do you see as the key successes of the 104(g) program? Please rank each factor on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1
	being the most significant. Please include comments, if appropriate.
	Improved system compliance
	Enhanced community and public education about wastewater treatment
	Financial savings or other direct economic benefits for communities
	Increased managerial and capital improvement planning skills at the local level
	Enhanced operator professionalism (certification, involvement in professional
	associations, participation in training)
	Development of a skilled technical assistance workforce, with special understanding of small
	communities' financial and political constraints
	Other, please specify
6.	What do you see as the main reason(s) for the 104(g) program's success? Please rank from in order of priority,
	with 1 being the most important.
	Commitment to long-term and comprehensive on-site assistance
	Assignment of technical assistance providers with special expertise
	in working with small communities
	Technical assistance by professionals with plant operating experience
	(peer-group assistance or mentoring approach)
	Partnerships with State agencies (non-monetary support such as referrals)
	Other, please specify